



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/497,801	02/04/2000	David Angelo Ferrucci	YO999-201	7921
21254	7590	06/16/2005	EXAMINER	
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2179

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SP

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/497,801	FERRUCCI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Doug Hutton	<b>Art Unit</b> 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2005.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7,21 and 25-37 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-7,21 and 25-37 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 February 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A Request for Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after Final Rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 24 January 2005 has been entered.

***Applicant's Response***

In Applicant's Response dated 24 February 2005, Applicant filed a Request for Continued Examination which requested that the proposed amendments in Applicant's Response dated 24 January 2005 be entered. In Applicant's Response dated 24 January 2005, Applicant amended the Specification, amended Claims 2 and 32-36, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 24 November 2004.

The objection to the Specification and the objections to Claims 2 and 32 that were previously set forth are withdrawn. The 112, second paragraph rejections for Claims 32 and 33 are withdrawn.

***Specification***

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: “consistency of the document model is maintained based on said linking” (see Claim 5, Lines 3-4).

Nowhere in the Specification is there discussed a “maintaining” of the “consistency” of a “document model.” If the examiner is wrong, then Applicant should point out where this limitation is discussed by page and line number.

***Claim Objections***

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “comprises an object-oriented domain model” in Lines 1-2 should be amended to — is — because the limitation reciting that the domain model is “object-oriented” is previously recited (see Claim 1, Line 4); and
- the term “the” in Line 3 should be amended to — a — because no “document model” is previously recited in the claims.

Claim 33 remains objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term “then” should be inserted between the terms “identifier,” and “the” in Line 2 because the action in the second phrase is performed only if the condition

- recited in the first phrase is satisfied (see Specification – Page 13, Line 19 through Page 14, Line 2); and
- the term “first” should be inserted between the term “the” in Line 2 and the term “ORAL” in Line 3 because that is how the element is previously identified (see Claim 33, Line 2).

Claim 34 remains objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “expression the” in Line 2 should be amended to — expression and the — because the first two phrases of the claim recite conditions that must be fulfilled before the actions recited in the third and fourth phrases are performed (see Specification – Page 13, Line 19 through Page 14, Line 2); and
- the term “then” should be inserted between the terms “element,” and “the” in Line 3 because the actions recited in the third and fourth phrases are performed only if the conditions recited in the first and second phrases are satisfied (see Specification – Page 13, Line 19 through Page 14, Line 2).

Claim 34 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “said ORAL expression” in Lines 1-2 should be amended to — a first ORAL expression — because Claim 32, upon which Claim 34 depends, recites a “plurality of ORAL expressions” (see Claim 32, Lines 5-6); and

Art Unit: 2179

- the phrase “said ORAL expression” in Line 4 should be amended to — said first ORAL expression — so that the phrase corresponds to the above suggested amendment.

Claim 35 remains objected to because of the following informalities:

- the comma between the terms “expression” and “and” in Line 2 should be removed because the first two phrases of the claim recite conditions that must be fulfilled before the action recited in the third phrase is performed (see Specification – Page 14, Lines 3-5); and
- the term “then” should be inserted between the terms “element,” and “said” in Line 3 because the action recited in the third phrase is performed only if the conditions in the first and second phrases are satisfied (see Specification – Page 14, Lines 3-5).

Claim 35 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “said ORAL expression” in Lines 1-2 should be amended to — a first ORAL expression — because Claim 32, upon which Claim 35 depends, recites a “plurality of ORAL expressions” (see Claim 32, Lines 5-6); and
- the phrase “said ORAL expression” in Lines 3-4 should be amended to — said first ORAL expression — so that the phrase corresponds to the above suggested amendment.

Claim 36 remains objected to because of the following informalities:

- the comma between the terms “identifier” and “and” in Line 2 should be removed because the first two phrases of the claim recite conditions that must be fulfilled before the action recited in the third phrase is performed (see Specification – Page 14, Lines 6-7); and
- the term “then” should be inserted between the terms “element,” and “said” in Line 2 because the action recited in the third phrase is performed only if the conditions recited in the first and second phrases are satisfied (see Specification – Page 14, Lines 6-7).

Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase “said ORAL expression” in Lines 1-2 should be amended to — a first ORAL expression — because Claim 32, upon which Claim 36 depends, recites a “plurality of ORAL expressions” (see Claim 32, Lines 5-6); and
- the phrase “said ORAL expression” in Line 3 should be amended to — said first ORAL expression — so that the phrase corresponds to the above suggested amendment.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

*Claims 34-36:*

Claim 34 recites the limitation “wherein if said ORAL expression” in Lines 1-2. This limitation is indefinite because it is unclear to which oral expression the limitation refers. Claim 32, from which Claim 34 depends, recites a “plurality of ORAL expressions” (see Claim 32, Lines 4-5).

Applicant may obviate this rejection by amending the limitation to — wherein if a first ORAL expression of said ORAL expressions comprises a single identifier, then said first ORAL expression corresponds to a domain knowledge element —.

For purposes of examination, the examiner will assume that the limitation reads per the suggested amendment.

Claims 35 and 36 have the same problem.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-7, 21 and 25-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Porter, U.S. Patent No. 6,473,892.

*Claim 1:*

Porter discloses a method of linking domain knowledge to document knowledge (see Figures 1-10; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 20, Line 34 – Porter discloses this limitation, as indicated in the cited figures and text and in the following discussion), comprising:

- rendering document knowledge as textual components with variable fields (The examiner interprets this limitation to mean that the user of a document assembly system is asked a series of questions via a GUI comprising: 1) text that asks the questions, and 2) either drop-down windows or input blanks to enter the answers to those questions. In *Porter*: see Figures 1 and 2; see Column 6, Lines 4-16; see Column 6, Line 63 through Column 7, Line 27 – Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system includes data entry screens that allow the user to input data.);
- building an object-oriented domain model comprising domain knowledge (The examiner interprets this limitation to mean that the document assembly system includes a database of objects that is accessed to construct one or more

documents by using the objects in the database. This database is “loosely coupled” to the system in that it stands alone and is independent from both the document assembly system and the documents constructed using that system.

In *Porter*: see Figure 2; see Column 7, Lines 11-53 – Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system includes a source code library comprising objects used to dynamically construct one or more documents based on the input data received from the user. Additionally, the source code library is “loosely coupled” to the document assembly system in that the library may be used to create many different documents using the objects contained in the library.); and

- linking said document knowledge to said domain knowledge, by linking said domain knowledge to document knowledge variables (The examiner interprets this limitation to mean that the document assembly system links the input received from the user, and thus the questions on the GUI, to objects in the database of objects. In *Porter*: see Figure 2; see Column 7, Line 11-53 – Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system includes an input data structure that organizes the user input data into a set of variables that an interpreter consults when determining the various documents to construct and the content to include in the various documents. Thus, the series of questions presented to the user via a GUI is “linked” to the objects in the source code library.).

*Claim 2:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said document knowledge variables are linked to domain knowledge elements in said domain model, such that if rules and constraints are tailored or developed to maintain consistency of the domain model, a document model will be affected (see Column 7, Lines 24-27; see Column 7, Lines 54-56; see Column 14, Line 64 through Column 15, Line 67; see Column 17, Lines 23-55 – Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system allows a programmer to change the rules that affect the content of constructed documents, and, when a programmer does, the content of the structured documents are affected, as clearly indicated in the cited text).

*Claim 3:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein elements in the domain model influence what appears in a rendered document (Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system *inherently* includes “elements in the domain model” that “influence what appears in a rendered document” in that the objects in the source code library are used to generate the documents. In other words, the objects in the source code library determine the structure and content of the documents, thus “influencing what appears in a rendered document.”).

*Claim 4:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said domain model comprises an explicit domain model which is reusable for a plurality of documents (As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses a source code library that is “loosely coupled” to the document assembly system and is used to create many different types of documents.).

*Claim 5:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said domain model comprises an object-oriented domain model independent of any document to be rendered (The examiner interprets this phrase to indicate that the model is “loosely coupled” to the document assembly system. In *Porter*: as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses a source code library that is “loosely coupled” to the document assembly system. Thus, the source code library is “independent of any document to be rendered.”), said domain model being usable for any of a plurality of documents (As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses this limitation.) and consistency of the document model is maintained based on said linking (The examiner interprets this phrase to mean that the document assembly system includes rules that link the “document model” to the “domain model.” The examiner interprets a “document model” as being the user’s answers to the questions presented to the user by the document assembly system in order to determine the structure and content of the document to be assembled. Using the rules established by the programmer who set up

the document assembly system, the system will produce the same document for the same set of user answers, and thus “maintain consistency of the document model based on the linking.” In *Porter*, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses an input data structure that organizes the user input data into a set of variables that an interpreter consults when determining the various documents to construct and the content to include in the various documents. As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 2, Porter discloses that a programmer may elect to change the rules that affect the content of assembled documents. Thus, the rules in Porter “maintain consistency” between a “document model” and the “domain model.”).

*Claim 6:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein a plurality of documents are configurable from the domain model (The examiner interprets this phrase to indicate that the model is “loosely coupled” to the document assembly system. In *Porter*, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses a source code library that is “loosely coupled” to the document assembly system. Thus, a plurality of documents are “configurable from the domain model.”).

*Claim 7:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said domain model comprises a stand-alone domain model, which is built separate and independent from a document (The examiner interprets this phrase to indicate that the model is “loosely coupled” to

the document assembly system. In **Porter**: as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses a source code library that is “loosely coupled” to the document assembly system. Thus, the source code library comprises a “stand-alone domain model, which is built separate and independent from a document.”).

*Claim 26:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 1, wherein said domain knowledge comprises domain knowledge elements (As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses a source code library that comprises objects.), and said domain knowledge elements are linked to said document knowledge variables (As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses questions presented to the user via the GUI that are “linked” to objects in the source code library.).

*Claim 27:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 26, wherein said domain knowledge elements are dynamically bound to said document knowledge variables through an object model access expression (The examiner interprets the phrase “object model access expression” to merely be the rules that establish the links generated at runtime between the questions presented to the user via the GUI and the objects in the database of objects. In **Porter**: as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses this limitation. That is, the input data structure is dynamically generated, and

the rules of the system dynamically establish the links between the questions presented to the user via the GUI and the objects in the source code library.).

*Claim 28:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 27, wherein each of said document knowledge variables is assigned an object model access expression (The examiner interprets this limitation to indicate that *each answer* given by the user affects the content/structure of the documents that are assembled. In *Porter*: each answer given by the user affects the content/structure of the documents that are assembled. That is, the rules used to assemble the documents include “expressions” for each answer given in the user input that will affect the content/structure of the assembled documents.)

*Claim 29:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 27, further comprising:

- enforcing the link between said domain knowledge and said document knowledge whenever a change occurs in at least one of said object model access expression of one of said document knowledge variables and said domain model (Porter discloses this limitation in that, because the rules **define** the links, the links between the domain knowledge and the document knowledge are *inherently* “enforced” regardless of whether a change in the object model access expression is made. In other words, any change that is made in the rules

will be “enforced” in the links between the objects in the source code library and the questions on the GUI.).

*Claim 30:*

- Porter discloses the method of Claim 27, further comprising:
  - evaluating the object model access expression of each of said document knowledge variables and linking them to appropriate domain knowledge elements whenever new document knowledge is inputted (The examiner interprets the phrase “whenever new document knowledge is inputted” to mean when a user answers the questions of the GUI to assemble a new document. In **Porter**, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, the source code library is “loosely coupled” to the document assembly system. Thus, each time the user answers the questions presented via the GUI, the document assembly system executes the rules that establish the links between the questions on the GUI and the objects in the source code library.).

*Claim 31:*

- Porter discloses the method of Claim 27, further comprising:
  - re-evaluating the object model access expression of each of said document knowledge variables whenever the domain model is reorganized (see Column 17, Lines 23-55 – Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system is modular and allows to a programmer to amend any part of the source

code library. Upon any amendment, the document assembly system will “re-evaluate” the rules that establish the links between the questions on the GUI and the objects in the source code library because the source code library is “loosely coupled” to the document assembly system and is accessed every time a user answers the questions presented via the GUI.).

*Claim 32:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 26, wherein said document knowledge variables are linked to said domain knowledge elements by selecting specific properties from the domain model by an object representation and access language, wherein said object representation and access language comprises a plurality of ORAL expressions (As indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1 and 2, Porter discloses rules that link the series of questions presented to the user via a GUI to the objects in the source code library. These rules comprise an “object representation and access language” and a “plurality of ORAL expressions” in that the rules are written in a computer language and comprise a plurality of rules. The rules link “document knowledge variables” to “domain knowledge elements” by “selecting a specific property from the domain model” in that the rules affect the content and structure of the assembled document. That is, the rules, based on the user’s answers to the questions presented to the user, select the appropriate “properties” from the domain model elements in order to assemble the document. Also, see Figures 3-5 and Column 8, Line 15 through Column 11, Line 20 – Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system includes a form

generator and a text generator that comprise rules that handle each answer provided by the user via the GUI and link each answer to the appropriate objects and the corresponding properties in the source code library.).

*Claim 33:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 32, wherein if a first ORAL expression of said plurality of ORAL expressions comprises a single identifier, the first ORAL expression corresponds to a domain knowledge element (see Figures 3-5; see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 11, Line 20 – Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system includes a form generator and a text generator that comprise commands that include only one identifier that corresponds to domain knowledge element. For example, if the user input includes the value “Construction,” then the command with the identifier “Construction” is executed during document assembly (see Column 8, Lines 21-28). As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 32, each command corresponds to the appropriate object and the corresponding property in the source code library.).

*Claim 34:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 32, wherein if said ORAL expression comprises an identifier pre-appended to a second ORAL expression the second ORAL expression corresponds to a domain knowledge element, the identifier corresponds to a property of the domain knowledge element and said ORAL expression corresponds to

the property of the domain knowledge element (see Figures 3-5; see Column 8, Line 15 through Column 11, Line 20 – Porter discloses this limitation in that the document assembly system includes a form generator and a text generator that comprise commands that include one or more identifiers, and, as indicated in the cited figures and text, each identifier points to an object in the source code library that includes options comprising procedures that select the appropriate object and the corresponding property from the source code library. For example, if the user input includes the values “Construction” and “Texas,” then the command with the identifiers “Construction” and “Texas” is executed during document assembly (see Column 8, Lines 28-33).).

*Claim 35:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 32, wherein if said oral expression comprises an identifier pre-appended to a second oral expression, and the second oral expression does not correspond to a domain knowledge element, said oral expression does not correspond to anything (As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 33, Porter discloses a command that embeds one identifier inside another identifier. Thus, if the embedded identifier fails to identify an object and the corresponding property from the source code library, then that command will not be executed. Thus, the command will not correspond to an object from the source code library.).

*Claim 36:*

Porter discloses the method of Claim 32, wherein if said ORAL expression comprises an identifier, and said identifier does not correspond to a domain knowledge element, said ORAL expression does not correspond to anything (As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 33, Porter discloses a command that includes only one identifier. Thus, *if* the identifier fails to identify an object and the corresponding property from the source code library, then that command will not be executed. Thus, the command will not correspond to an object from the source code library.).

*Claim 21:*

Porter discloses a system of linking domain knowledge to document knowledge (see Figures 1-10; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 20, Line 34 – Porter discloses this limitation, as indicated in the cited figures and text and in the following discussion), comprising:

- means for rendering document knowledge as textual components with variable fields;
- building an object-oriented domain model comprising domain knowledge; and
- linking said document knowledge to said domain knowledge, by linking said domain knowledge to document knowledge variables (As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses the functions of the above limitations.

Also, as clearly indicated in Porter, the document assembly system is computer-based and thus includes all computer hardware and software needed to

assemble documents. Applicant's "means for" performing these functions include no hardware and software components that are not disclosed in Porter.).

*Claim 25:*

Claim 25 merely recites computer software for performing the method of Claim 1. Porter discloses computer software that performs the method recited in Claim 1. Thus, Porter discloses every limitation of Claim 25, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1.

*Claim 37:*

Porter discloses a method of generating document (see Figures 1-10; see Column 1, Line 1 through Column 20, Line 34 – Porter discloses this limitation, as indicated in the cited figures and text), comprising:

- rendering document knowledge as textual components with variable fields;
- building an object-oriented domain model comprising domain knowledge; and
- linking said document knowledge to said domain knowledge, by linking said domain knowledge to document knowledge variables (As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses the above limitations.).

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 24 January 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

*Arguments for Claims 1, 21 and 25:*

Applicant argues that Porter fails to disclose "building an object-oriented domain model including domain knowledge" because Porter automatically produces one or more documents corresponding to a single specific transaction. Applicant further argues that "the data input by the user [in Porter] is not organized as an object model." Applicant also argues that the present invention creates a domain model that is independent from the documents being created that may be used later to create additional documents in different transactions and is not limited to being used in a single transaction, as taught by Porter. See *Applicant's Response* – Page 9, first paragraph through Page 10, first partial paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

Firstly, the examiner agrees that Porter discloses automatically producing one or more documents corresponding to a single specific transaction. However, Porter also discloses "building an object-oriented domain model comprising domain knowledge," as recited in the claims.

Secondly, the examiner notes that the claims of the present invention do not recite that the ***data input*** by the user is "organized as an object model." Rather, the claims only recite "building an object-oriented domain model comprising domain

knowledge" (see Claim 1, Line 4). That is, the claims do not recite **what is used** to "build" the object-oriented domain model. The claims merely recite that the object-oriented domain model is built. Applicant appears to be reading limitations from the Specification into the claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 1, Porter discloses a document assembly system comprising a **source code library** comprising **objects** used to dynamically construct one or more documents based on the input data received from the user. In order for the source code library to exist, it must have been "**built**" by a computer programmer. The source code library comprises "**domain knowledge**" in that it includes the various data and functions that are used to assemble the documents. The source code library is "**object-oriented**" in that it includes both **data** and **functions** that are used to assemble the documents.

Accordingly, Porter discloses "building an object-oriented domain model comprising domain knowledge," as recited in the claims.

*Arguments for Claims 27 and 29:*

Applicant argues that Porter fails to disclose that "said domain knowledge elements are dynamically bound to said document knowledge variables through an object model access expression" (as recited in Claim 27) and "enforcing the link

between said domain knowledge and said document knowledge whenever a change occurs in at least one of said object model access expression of one of said document knowledge variables and said domain model" (as recited in Claim 29) because Porter does not disclose that the linkage between the document being assembled and the domain model may be "dynamically manipulated" during the interactive configuration of the document. Applicant argues further that Porter does not provide for an interactive configuration of a document because: 1) Porter automatically determines which documents are needed and which paragraphs should be included in each document, and then automatically generates the documents; and 2) once the data is input into the system, Porter does not allow the data to be changed. See *Applicant's Response* – Page 10, first full paragraph through third full paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

Firstly, the examiner notes that the claims of the present invention do not recite that the linkage between the document being assembled and the domain model may be "dynamically manipulated" ***during the interactive configuration of the document***. Applicant appears to interpret Claims 27 and 29 as reciting that ***a user*** may dynamically manipulate the linkage between the document being assembled and the domain model ***during document assembly***. Again, the claims do not recite such a limitation.

Claim 27 recites that "said domain knowledge elements ***are dynamically bound*** to said document knowledge variables through an object model access expression" (emphasis added). The claim does not mention ***who*** or ***what*** "dynamically binds" the domain knowledge elements to the document knowledge variables. Also, the claim

does not mention **when** the domain knowledge elements are “dynamically bound” to the document knowledge variables. Rather, the claim only recites that the domain knowledge elements **are** “dynamically bound” to the document knowledge variables.

As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 27, the input data structure disclosed in Porter is dynamically generated, and the rules of the system **dynamically establish** the **links** between the questions presented to the user via the GUI and the objects in the source code library. The examiner notes that the links are established during assembly of the documents.

Claim 29 recites “enforcing the link between said domain knowledge and said document knowledge **whenever a change occurs** in at least one of said object model access expression of one of said document knowledge variables and said domain model” (emphasis added). The claim does not mention **when** the change in the “object model access expression” occurs. Also, the claim does not mention **who** or **what** changes the “object model access expression.” Rather, the claim only recites that the link is enforced **whenever a change occurs** in the “object model access expression.”

As indicated in the above rejection for Claim 29, the rules of the document assembly system define the links. These rules comprise the “object model access expressions” of the system disclosed in Porter. Whenever a change occurs in these rules, the rules will be “enforced” in the links between the objects in the source code library and the questions on the GUI.

Secondly, the claims do not recite an “**interactive** configuration of [a] document,” as argued by Applicant. The examiner notes that neither the term “interactive” nor any

variation thereof is recited in the claims. The examiner also notes that a "user" is not recited in the claims. Applicant appears to be reading limitations from the Specification into the claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### ***Conclusion***

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH  
June 13, 2005



**DOUG HUTTON  
PATENT EXAMINER  
TECH CENTER 2100**